DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 157 IR 012 210

AUTHOR Ittelson, John C.; Wold, Jean E.
TITLE A Model for the Development of Individualized Instruction Networking.
PUB DATE 12 Oct 85
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Society for Individualized Instruction (Newark, NJ, October 12, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty Development; Graduate School Faculty; Higher Education; Individual Development; *Individualized Instruction; Instructional Innovation; *Models; Nursing Education; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *California State University Chico; *Guided Design

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the creation and implementation of a faculty development system at California State University at Chico which uses the "guided design" approach for teacher improvement. Following a discussion of previous faculty development efforts at Chico, a history of the guided design project is presented, and the sequence of events leading to its utilization by members of the nursing faculty are outlined. Six elements that are crucial to the success of this type of program are identified: (1) a focus for professional and faculty development activity on campus; (2) continuous interdisciplinary networking and feedback; (3) resource people who are sensitive enough to challenge the faculty to explore new ideas; (4) mentoring and sponsoring relationships between faculty; (5) campus visitors who are experts in various modes of innovative teaching techniques; and (6) sharing of ideas and successes. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272157

A MODEL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION NETWORKING

FEATURED PRESENTATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

1985 CONFERENCE

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

OCTOBER 12

ROBESON CENTER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

NEWARK, N.J.

BY

JOHN C. ITTELSON
PROFESSOR INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

AND

JEAN E. WOLD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR NURSING

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO

CHICO, CA 95929

IR012210

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John C. Ittelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In this presentation we plan to discuss a model for faculty development that has been going on at California State University, Chico for the last three years. We are very pleased with the success that we have had on our campus. Although we realize that everything we have done is not transferable to other campuses, we think that a number of the key factors that led to success would be useful to share with others. We will provide the opportunity for other people who have been involved in faculty development to reflect on these and give us suggestions on ways we might move in the future.

First, let me describe California State University, Chico and its faculty development program in a little greater detail. California State University, Chico is a medium-size campus in the 19 campus California State University system. Those of you who are not from California, may not realize the separation between the University of California campuses UCLA, Berkeley, Santa Cruz, etc. (the nine campuses) and the 19 campuses that represent the California State University System. As a part of the C.S.U. system, we have a student population of approximately 14,000 full-time equivalents and a faculty of approximately 700 full-time equivalents with somewhere in the 620-630 range representing full-time faculty status. The primary focus of the C.S.U. system is undergraduate teaching. This is evidenced by the small classrooms and emphasis on student-faculty personal contact.

The professional development activities on our campus, although spread out among the six schools, are focused primarily out of the graduate school which contains both our graduate school and our professional research and professional development organization. In fact, one of the points that we are going to talk about is that it is important to having a successful faculty development program, that there be a <u>focal point</u> where faculty who have interests know they can turn.

Professional development and faculty development of the graduate school have a number of programs. A program which is called <u>affirmative action grants</u> (grants that are funded by both local funds and state funds) is designed to increase under-represented populations within our faculty. It helps under-represented faculty through professional development, which in turn increases the possibility of promotion, retention of promotion and tenure. <u>Local innovation grants</u> are funds set aside at the state level with supplemental funds from the University for the improvement of instruction locally. These grants traditionally have been used for release time for development of new courses. Local innovation grants might be used for experimental classes and inter-disciplinary activities that would not normally take place in instruction. We have state innovation grants which are considerably larger. Local innovation grants are in the $500 to $2,000 range. The <u>Chancellor grants</u> can be in the $5,000 to $30,000 range. These are grants, again, for local innovative

instruction. At the state level, they are looking for activities that will not only affect particular campuses where they have needs but possibly generate interest beyond the campus to some of the other 19 campuses. There is another area of professional development which is professional education funds, the training funds which are made available along with resources involved with extramural funding grant activity; the seeking out of grant opportunities, notifying faculty of potential research and grant opportunities and facilitating completion of competition for these.

The graduate school in its role of professional and faculty development holds a number of workshops. These are held primarily during what is called our Intersession. California State University, Chico is on a semester system that allows for a three-week break during the month of January referred to as Intersession. There are some state supported courses, primarily extension courses. I would say, the majority of our faculty do not teach during that period but are available for various academic and consulting pursuits.

On a regular basis each fall, the faculty is polled for areas of interest. There are various degrees of input through selective contacting of department chairs and faculty members. Additional ideas are solicited for our faculty development Intersession workshops. The topics of these range very broadly from faculty burn-out to how to edit a file on our University Computer Center to workshops that are dealing specifically with instruction in faculty development.

Three years ago, Dr. Claude Mathis from Northwestern University Center for the Teaching Professions came and spoke, using a series of videotapes called Classroom College Vignettes. In these videotapes there were a number of examples of very different classroom teaching styles, not that they were all excellent or all poor, but they just showed critical instances in classrooms with various faculty members. These tapes came from a number of campuses. That session was extremely well attended and out of that came a group of faculty members who were interested in pursuing more information about different teaching strategies and styles and were willing to try to do some experimenting. A group of about 12 faculty wanted to pursue the workshop, beyond the 50 or 60 who attended it, in greater detail. This desire was combined with the opportunity presented our campus through the Exxon foundation to try to diffuse or disseminate the decision-making process of instruction, advocated through "Guided Design" and Charlie Wales at work.

It is at this time that I formally became involved with the professional development program. I was appointed as faculty member to facilitate the "Guided Design" project and to work on other Faculty Development projects (ie videotaping of faculty for

their review).

In July 1983 I went to the campus of the University of Oregon Summer Faculty Development Workshop to observe a "Guided Design" Workshop and meet with Dr. Charles Wales to plan Chico's January Intersession Workshop. After meeting with Charles Wales I return to campus and spent the fall meeting with department chairs and faculty that had indicated interest in teaching and individualized instruction. The Mathis workshop had provided a base of faculty to contact for the up-coming "Guided Design" program. We talked to a number of faculty members within our engineering school who had, in fact, used "Guided Design". Thus we got our core group to attend the initial Guided Design workshop which was held in January of 1984. Interested faculty were provided with copies of the "Guided Design" Text to review before the Intersession Workshop.

In January 1984 Dr. Charles Wales presented three workshops: (1) an overview of "Guided Design" (2) an in-depth workshop with a working session to get participants started on their own Guided Design projects (3) a colloquium of the Engineering and Computer science faculty to discuss the use of "Guided Design" in the Engineering program at West Virgina University.

Charlie indicated that nursing faculty had been a group who had accepted the"Guided Design" concept on a number of campuses. San Francisco State had the most recent "Guided Design" workshop with Charlie through a School of Nursing. So, one of the target departments from which I sought out individuals was the Nursing Department on our campus which just happened to be going through reviews of their curriculum to make changes in their program. I initially contacted Jean and I'll let her pick up from here.

. . .

As a nursing faculty member on the California State University, Chico campus, I entered the scene at that point. The Guided Design Intersession Forum brochure sparked my interest. An attempt to involve other nursing faculty members at that time was unsuccessful. A realistic data base for convincing them was the missing element. The Intersession workshop presented by Charles Wales on Guided Design captured my imagination. An idea for a nursing class dealing with decision making slowly developed into a viable project. Both internal and external facilitation factors were important to the fruition of the project;

A) Internal Facilitation

1. The encouragement and direct media assistance of the faculty development representative.

2. Transcribing and telephone assistance from the graduate school.

3. Interdisciplinary faculty contacts for sharing.

B) External Facilitation

1. Availability of previous projects through telephone contacts with nurses from other campuses.

2. Encouragement and review of the emerging project from Charles Wales.

3. I.S.I.I. opportunity.

Once completed and field tested the project seemed to lend itself to a viable ISII paper. It was accepted for the 1984, conference. A second faculty member from Engineering also had a paper accepted. We traveled together to Atlanta and were both impressed with the quality and structure of the conference, and the instructional dedication of the interdisciplinary participants. In addition, I was elected to the ISII Board of Directors, a definite stimulus to share the experience and bolster my own efforts.

These factors brought about a personal transition from an interest in innovative instruction to an interest in helping as a facilitator on our own campus. My role changed from participant to active leader in continued faculty development. Having been mentored carefully myself I was motivated to act as mentor and facilitator to others. I did a lot of talking and encouraging among my fellow nursing faculty members and became John's unremunerated assistant on the campus.

The sequence of events were as follows:

1. A follow up January Intersession Forum on Guided Design was scheduled. It resulted in attendance of 15 faculty members. The program was presented by the faculty development representative, myself, and Charles, who had also presented a paper at the 1984, ISII conference. It included an introduction to ISII purposes and functions.

2. March. A return visit of Charles Wales to the campus that included personal appointments with pre-identified interested faculty members.

3. May. A follow up on-campus meeting seeking interest input for other innovative personalized instruction leaders to bring to campus during the next Intersession.

4. May, June, July. Continued personal contacts disseminating information both verbal and written on the part of the faculty development representative and myself.

5. Three persons from Chico with papers at the current ISII 1985 conference.

6. Release time granted three faculty members of the nursing division through faculty development to work on projects.

7. Five persons from Chico attending the current ISII conference with assistance and some travel funding through the faculty development office.

8. Group of attendees report to core of interested campus faculty members.

9. Dreams for the future:

    1. Mini-ISII-type conferences on campus during a future Intersession.

    2. A regional satellite ISII conference in conjunction with an East coast conference.

    3. Regional ISII conference on the West coast.

    The realization of these dreams, of course, remains to be seen.

At this point John and I would like to recap our assessment of the critical elements to the success of this type of program.

#1 Focus of Activity on Campus

One thing that we felt that was critical was that there be a focus for a professional development and faculty development activity on campus. Not that the facility had to be a major center, but that there needed to be a spot where faculty members knew they could turn if they had interest.

#2 Continuous interdisciplinary networking and feedback.

Creating new teaching materials when one can get by with the old can be a thankless, arduous task. Depending upon students for encouraging feedback can be discouraging. Students tend to resist change and prefer familiar, comfortable, passive instructional techniques. Constructive feedback from colleagues stimulates the work ethic syndrome and helps conquer initial hurdles. Networking and exchange of ideas on campus stimulates individual efforts. The establishment of trust among faculty can smooth the inevitable kinks in new ventures and provide the

stimulus for joint efforts and the celebration of success--all common human needs.

#3 Involvement with Resource People meeting defined Campus interest

The role of resource people to provide new ideas and stimulate activity cannot be under-estimated. It is important that the resource people be sensitive to the needs of the campus and also strong enough to challenge the faculty to explore new ideas. The Guided Design program was fortunate to have Charles Wales and his presentations on campus. Support of the participating faculty was evident in the outcome of the projects.

#4 MENTORSHIP/SPONSORSHIP

Mentorship in its broadest definition has been used successfully in our model. In faculty development as we've experienced and used it, it means relationships that include sharing of ideas and information and support of risk-taking that leads to the satisfaction of all parties concerned and the mutual productivity of faculty members. It is not parental in nature but rather leans toward the collegiality end of the mentor continuum. It focuses on the strengths of ideas and projects rather than their weaknesses. It offers constructive criticism and assists with problem solving. The concept of subservience or ownership of ideas or rewards does not enter in. It is similar to Bolton's(1) first three stages of a sponsorship system. The interested faculty member:

1. Learns the ropes from an involved college
2. Develops his/her own projects
3. Sponsors other interested persons.

It's a circular concept. The results are mutually encouraging.

1. Bolton, E.B. (1980) "A Conceptual Analysis of the Mentoring Relationship in the Career-Development of Women." Adult Education, 30, 195-207.A

#5 EXPANDED REINFORCEMENT:

The opportunity to have the benefit of campus visitors who are experts in various modes of innovative teaching techniques along with institutional and collegial support has ultimately lead to the excitement of increasing the diffusion of new ideas in the form of attendance at this type of conference. The conference is not discipline bound. It provides a center for the dissemination of information and experiences. It can be used to augment, validate, and share individual and institutional efforts. It

provides the ultimate re-enforcer.

#6 SHARING SUCCESSES:

In higher education it is rare that we get to talk about teaching in the every day life of a faculty member. We are busy with many things that prevent that discussion. When we do get to it, it is generally with members of our own discipline and not with a broader spectrum of faculty members across the campus. By providing opportunities both locally and nationally (ISII) for individuals to share their successes and receive new ideas, we can encourage more faculty to explore new ways of teaching and learning with their students.

There are "no losers" in the model as we have experienced it. From the university, to the faculty development program, to experts sharing their knowledege,' to faculty members engaged in innovative, stimulating instruction programs, to collegiality on the campus, to the students, who become the ultimate beneficiaries, "everyone wins".

At this time we would like to field your comments and suggestions.